

Art Unit: 3737



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/796,584  
Filing Date: March 08, 2004  
Appellant(s): BAKER, CLARK R.

---

W. Allen Powell  
For Appellant

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 4, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed August 22, 2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

**WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS**

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner. After a careful review of applicant's arguments, see pages 5-8 of the Appeal brief, filed 02/04/08, with respect to claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore this rejection has been withdrawn.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

Non patent literature - "Masimo Signal Extraction Pulse Oximetry" (1999-2000),  
abstract, pages 476-477, 479-481, figs. 6-7.

5,662,106	Swedlow et al.	09-1997
2003/0036689	Diab et al.	02-2003

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

**NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION**

Appellant requested documentary support or evidence of the facts which were allegedly "well known" in the art at the time of Appellant's invention.

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diab et al. (US 2003/0036689) in view of Swedlow et al. (US 5,662,106) and further in view of non-patent literature "*Masimo Signal Extraction Pulse Oximetry*".**

With respect to claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-22, the Diab et al. patent teaches a system for detecting the presence of mixed venous and arterial blood pulsation in tissue, (abstract, paragraph 0019), obtaining a measure of a phase difference between said first and second electromagnetic radiation signals (paragraphs 0389-0391, fig. 25B, elements 694, 692, 690), comparing said measure with a threshold value to form a comparison (paragraph 0387, fig. 25B, elements 660, 662, 696); and detecting the presence or absence of venous pulsation using said comparison (paragraphs 0019, 0368). (NOTE: it is well known in the art that the primary cause of noise in transmissive pulse oximetry measurements is motion artifact caused by the movement of venous blood in the finger. See technical paper, "Masimo Signal Extraction Pulse Oximetry" (1999-2000), abstract, pages 476-477, 479-481 see sections: *Effect of motion on pulse oximetry*, *Accurate saturation measurement during motion*, *The Masimo pulse oximetry model*, *In vivo example of the effects of motion on CPO and Masimo SET pulse oximetry*, also see description of figs. 6 and 7).

Diab et al. do not disclose indicating the presence of venous pulsation to a caregiver if venous pulsation is present. However, the Swedlow et al. patent teaches an indication of the presence of venous pulsation to a caregiver if venous pulsation is present (see abstract, fig. 1, element 30, and figure 4, col. 5, line 64 - col. 6, line 34).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the system disclosed by Diab et al., with the above discussed enhancements because such modification would provide a more accurate blood oxygen and pulse readings.

With respect to claims 2 and 14, Diab et al. discloses filtering the electromagnetic radiation signals to pass signals having frequencies at or near the pulse rate or harmonics (pars. 0329, 0385).

With respect to claims 3-4 and 15-16, Diab et al. illustrates in figures 26-30 the measurement of both signals red and infrared, in which each of the signals is relatively undisturbed by motion artifact over a time period (pars. 0411-0414).

With respect to claims 6 and 18, Diab et al. discloses a method for analyzing and correlating the measured signals (pars. 0014).

With respect to claims 7 and 19, Diab et al. discloses a frequency domain analysis and subtraction of the signals (pars. 0032, 0082, 0090, 0402).

With respect to claims 8 and 20, the subtracting step by taking the complex conjugate of the signals and dividing it by the product of the magnitudes of the signals, it would have been an obvious design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to claims 9-11 and 21, Diab et al. discloses obtaining the measurement of the signals at or near a fundamental (first harmonic) or a harmonic of a pulse rate (pars. 0329, 0385, and 0400).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 5 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are deemed not persuasive.

In relation to appellant's argument that the Diab et al. reference does not disclose detecting the presence of venous pulsation. The examiner of record notes that the Diab et al. reference in Figure 25B and in paragraphs 0389-0396 of the specifications discloses calculating the phase differences between the red and infrared signals and compares it with a threshold value to detect the presence of venous blood pulsation.

In relation to appellant's argument that the examiner failed to produce documentary evidence to demonstrate that "the primary cause of noise in transmissive pulse oximetry measurements is motion artifact caused by the movement of venous blood in the finger". The examiner is providing a technical document (Masimo – "Discrete Saturation Transform") to disclose that it is commonly understood in pulse oximetry that the detected physiologic signals in response to both red and infrared light consist of desired signal portions as well as undesired signal or noise portions. The desired signal portions are proportional to one another through the arterial optical density ratio. The resultant is a reference signal that contains only noise portions.

Art Unit: 3737

Considering the finger for example, the venous blood in the vascular bed will be easily deformed during motion. In addition, the venous blood is a strong absorber of light. Hence, it can represent a significant contributor to the total optical density during motion episodes. During routine patient motions (shivering, waving, tapping, etc.), the resulting noise can be quite substantial and can easily overwhelm a conventional ratio based oximetry system. Having identified the venous blood as a significant contributor to noise during motion.

In response to the argument that the evidence submitted by the examiner in support of facts "well known" in the art at the time Appellant's application was filed is dated after the filing date of the present application. The examiner of record mistakenly cited the wrong date reference as evidence to support the official notice statement. As noted the new evidence submitted in this action is by the same assignee Masimo Corporation dated (1999-2000).

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section **(9)** above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* **dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) **Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) **Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/John F Ramirez/

Examiner, Art Unit 3737



May 1, 2009

**A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below:**

/DONALD T HAJEC/

Director, Technology Center 3700

Conferees:

/Angela D Sykes/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3762

Mr. Brian Casler  
SPE Art Unit 3737  
/BRIAN CASLER/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737